

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 2A

THE WASHINGTON TIMES  
25 May 1982

# *Curb on technology flow to Russia urged*

## INTERVIEW

### Sen. Jake Garn on the transfer of western technology to the U.S.S.R.

*High on the list of problems plaguing the U.S. relationship with the U.S.S.R. are the Yamal pipeline and the transfer of western technology to the Soviets.*

Sen. Jake Garn, R-Utah, takes a hard line on these issues. His proposals include strict trade embargoes and formation of an Office of Strategic Trade with primary responsibility for functions now scattered among several agencies.

Garn calls for review and revision of the list of critical technologies in this interview with Washington Times correspondent Jeffrey St. John.

**Q:** How much war-making potential are the Soviets provided through the transfer of Western technology?

**A:** It is difficult to put a dollar value on it. But, in my opinion, it is far beyond what anyone could imagine. Estimates I have seen are conservative. The more important point is that technology transfer costs us because it enhances their military capability, which we are obliged to counter with larger defense expenditures.

**Q:** Are you saying technology transfer to the Soviets escalates our defense budget?

**A:** Yes, and let me give a most recent example. One of the biggest cost items we are dealing with in the current defense budget is whether or not to build the MX missile. The major reason I believe this weapons system is necessary is the improved Soviet accuracy in SS18, their huge missile with 10 one-million-ton warheads. That was not a threat to our Minuteman. One of the things the Soviets lacked in order to improve the accuracy of their guidance system in the SS18 was very finely machined ball-bearings. For 11

years they tried to get us to sell them such technology and we refused. Finally, in 1971, during the Nixon-Kissinger era we did, during detente. With their greater accuracy threatening our Minuteman force we need MX. Now it isn't fair to say that all those billions for MX are attributable to technology transfer, but part of it is.

**Q:** Has lower-grade technology transfer to the Soviets helped enhance their military posture?

**A:** Yes, and the Karma River truck factory we helped the Soviets build is a good example. The trucks built there with American equipment, American computerized assembly lines, trucks manufactured in that plant hauled Soviet troops into Afghanistan. The list just goes on and on. Technology transfer has helped their military machine tremendously, it has helped them produce weapons that force us to spend more for defense. I think we could afford a much lower defense budget if we and our Western allies would quit selling them so much that aid their military posture.

**Q:** Back in April, during the Senate Banking Committee hearings on East-West trade, you said that the United States is fighting a "technology war" with the Soviets and western security may hinge on its outcome. What did you mean?

**A:** The Soviets have been very successful in buying or stealing U.S. technology which can bolster their military machine. Since World II western security has been based on a qualitative advantage of the United States and NATO to offset the vast numerical advantage of Warsaw pact armies. The Soviets have always been aware of their own technological lag. Now, when you combine numerical superiority in armaments with their own improved scientific abilities and with what they can buy, borrow or steal, they have reached a point where Soviet armaments, in key areas, are equal to or better than those of NATO.